Comment on "Fun and frustration with quarkonium in a $1+1$ dimension," by R. S. Bhalerao and B. Ram [Am. J. Phys. 69 (7), 817–818 (2001)]

R. M. Cavalcanti*
Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro
Caixa Postal 68528, 21945-970 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

arXiv:quant-ph/0201125v1 28 Jan 2002

In a recent paper, Bhalerao and Ram[1] solved the Dirac equation in $1+1$ dimensions with a Lorentz scalar potential given by

$$V(x) = g|x| \qquad (g > 0) \tag{1}$$

and came to the conclusion that the energy levels are given by

$$E = \pm\sqrt{2(n+1)g} \qquad (n \in \mathcal{I}), \tag{2}$$

where $\mathcal{I}$ is the set of non-negative integers that satisfy one of the conditions

$$H_{n+1}(m/\sqrt{g}) = \pm\sqrt{2(n+1)}\, H_n(m/\sqrt{g}). \tag{3}$$

$H_n(z)$ is the Hermite polynomial of degree n and m is the fermion mass. The purpose of this Comment is to point out that the energy spectrum obtained by in Ref. 1 is not correct, and to derive the correct one.

Our starting point is Eq. (6a) of Ref. 1. Its general solution is given by[2]

$$\psi_1(\xi) = C H_\nu(\xi)\, e^{-\xi^2/2} + D H_{-\nu-1}(i\xi)\, e^{\xi^2/2}, \tag{4}$$

where $\nu \equiv E^2/2g$, $\xi \equiv (m+gx)/\sqrt{g}$, and $H_\nu(z)$ is the Hermite function,[3] defined as

$$H_\nu(z) = \frac{2^\nu\,\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1-\nu}{2}\right)}\,\Phi\left(-\frac{\nu}{2},\frac{1}{2};z^2\right) + \frac{2^\nu\,\Gamma\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(-\frac{\nu}{2}\right)}\,z\Phi\left(\frac{1-\nu}{2},\frac{3}{2};z^2\right). \tag{5}$$

The confluent hypergeometric function $\Phi(a,b;z)$ is expressed as

$$\Phi(a,b;z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_k}{(b)_k}\,\frac{z^k}{k!}, \tag{6}$$

with $(a)_0 = 1$, $(a)_k = \Gamma(a+k)/\Gamma(a) = a(a+1)\cdots(a+k-1)$, $k = 1, 2, \ldots$

For large z and fixed ν, $H_\nu(z)$ behaves asymptotically as

$$H_\nu(z) \sim (2z)^\nu \qquad (|z| \to \infty), \tag{7}$$

provided that $|\arg z| \le \frac{3\pi}{4} - \delta$. Therefore, in order that $\psi_1(x)$ be square integrable at $x \to \infty$, it is necessary and sufficient to take $D = 0$ in Eq. (4), *regardless of the value of* ν. From Eq. (5a) of Ref. 1 and the identity $H'_\nu(\xi) = 2\nu H_{\nu-1}(\xi)$, it then follows that the second component of the Dirac bispinor ψ is given by

$$\psi_2(\xi) = C\,\frac{E}{\sqrt{g}}\,H_{\nu-1}(\xi)\,e^{-\xi^2/2}. \tag{8}$$

Equations (4) (with $D = 0$) and (8) are valid for $x \ge 0$; for $x \le 0$ they must be replaced by

$$\psi_1(\xi') = C'\frac{E}{\sqrt{g}}\,H_{\nu-1}(\xi')\,e^{-\xi'^2/2}, \tag{9a}$$

$$\psi_2(\xi') = C' H_\nu(\xi')\,e^{-\xi'^2/2}, \tag{9b}$$

where $\xi' \equiv (m-gx)/\sqrt{g}$. The continuity of ψ_1 and ψ_2 at $x = 0$ leads to the condition

$$H_\nu^2\,(m/\sqrt{g}) - 2\nu H_{\nu-1}^2\,(m/\sqrt{g}) = 0. \tag{10}$$

This equation is equivalent to Eq. (15) of Ref. 1 [Eq. (3) of this Comment] if n is not required to be a non-negative integer. In Ref. 1, however, this equation is a supplementary condition imposed on the previously determined energy levels (2). Here, in contrast, the energy levels are determined solely by Eq. (10).

It remains to be seen whether Eq. (10) has any solutions. In the Appendix, I prove that it has an infinite number of solutions if $m = 0$. Unfortunately, I have not been able to generalize the proof to the $m \neq 0$ case. However, a numerical attack to the problem reveals the existence of solutions to Eq. (10) for $m \neq 0$. Table I lists the first five solutions to that equation for several values of m.

TABLE I. First five values of $\nu \equiv E^2/2g$ for different values of $\alpha \equiv m/\sqrt{g}$.

ν	$\alpha = 0$	$\alpha = 1$	$\alpha = 2$
ν_0	0.345459	1.396274	3.338595
ν_1	1.548571	3.056760	5.452161
ν_2	2.468573	4.306277	7.006087
ν_3	3.522295	5.615211	8.568946
ν_4	4.482395	6.804771	9.978608

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I thank Dr. R. S. Bhalerao for his comments on the first version of this paper. This work was supported by FAPERJ.

APPENDIX A:

Let me show that Eq. (10) has an infinite number of solutions if $m = 0$. Indeed, in this case Eq. (10) reduces to

$$f(\nu) \equiv H_\nu^2(0) - 2\nu H_{\nu-1}^2(0) = 0. \tag{A1}$$

It is clear that ν cannot be negative, for then $f(\nu)$ is strictly positive. If $\nu = 0$ or $\nu = 2k$, k a positive integer, then $2\nu H_{\nu-1}^2(0)$ vanishes (in the latter case because $H_{2k-1}(x)$ is an odd function of x) and $H_\nu^2(0) > 0$. Therefore, $f(\nu) > 0$ if ν is a non-negative even integer. On the other hand, $f(\nu) < 0$ if ν is a positive odd integer, for then $H_\nu(0) = 0$ and $2\nu H_{\nu-1}^2(0) > 0$. Because $f(\nu)$ is a continuous function of ν, one is led to the conclusion that $f(\nu)$ vanishes at least once in each interval $(n, n+1)$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ A more refined analysis, in which one uses the identity (cf. Eq. (5))

$$H_\nu(0) = \frac{2^\nu \, \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1-\nu}{2}\right)}, \tag{A2}$$

shows that $f(\nu)$ in fact vanishes only once in these intervals. It follows that the energy levels in the massless case are given by

$$E = \pm\sqrt{2\nu_n g}, \tag{A3}$$

with ν_n satisfying $n < \nu_n < n + 1$, $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$

---

* Electronic mail: rmoritz@if.ufrj.br

[1] R. S. Bhalerao and B. Ram, "Fun and frustration with quarkonium in a $1 + 1$ dimension," Am. J. Phys. **69** (7), 817–818 (2001).

[2] N. N. Lebedev, *Special Functions and Their Applications* (Dover, New York, 1972), Chap. 10.

[3] The Hermite function $H_\nu(z)$ should not be confused with the Hermite polynomials. The latter are a special case of the former, when ν is a non-negative integer.